

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

TARROUNCE MASSENGILL, ET AL.,	§	
PLAINTIFFS,	§	
	§	
V.	§	CIVIL CASE No. 3:25-CV-189-E-BK
	§	
CARL OSCAR SHERMAN, SR., ET AL.,	§	
DEFENDANTS.	§	

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)](#) and *Special Order 3*, this *pro se* case was referred to the United States magistrate judge for judicial screening, including the issuance of findings and a recommended disposition when appropriate. Upon review, this action should be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for failure to comply with a court order and for want of prosecution.


On January 29, 2025, the Court issued a deficiency order, which required Plaintiffs to (1) file an amended motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, (2) file an amended complaint that meets the requirements of Rule 8(a) and Rule 11(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and (3) register to use the Court’s electronic filing system. [Doc. 6](#). The deadline for Plaintiffs’ response was February 19, 2025. As of the date of this recommendation, however, neither Plaintiff has responded to the Court’s deficiency order, nor have they sought an extension of time to do so.

Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. [Larson v. Scott](#), 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 (5th Cir. 1998). “This authority flows from the court’s inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending

cases.” *Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co., Ltd.*, 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th Cir. 1985) (citing *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626 (1962)).

Plaintiffs have been given ample opportunity to respond to the Court’s deficiency order. They have impliedly refused or declined to do so. Therefore, this action should be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for failure to comply with a court order and for want of prosecution. See **FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b)** (an involuntary dismissal “operates as an adjudication on the merits,” unless otherwise specified).

SO RECOMMENDED on March 14, 2025.



RENEE HARRIS TOLIVER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

A copy of this report and recommendation will be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this report and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. See **28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)**; **FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)**. An objection must identify the finding or recommendation to which objection is made, the basis for the objection, and the place in the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. See *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996), *modified by statute on other grounds*, **28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)** (extending the time to object to 14 days).